

6
IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE
DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MAY 1998

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.C. BHARUKA

WRIT PETITION NO. 13470/1998

BETWEEN: -

Sri P. Narayana reddy,
aged 47 years,
S/o late G. Pillareddy,
R/o No. 18, 3rd Main Road,
6th Cross, Jakkasandra Village
Koramangala 1st Block,
Bangalore-560 034.

370
..PETITIONER

(By Sri S. G. Bhat, Advocate)

AND: -

The Bangalore Metropolitan Transport
Corporation, Central Offices,
Shanthinagar, Bangalore-560 027,
By its Managing Director.

..RESPONDENT

* * *

This Writ Petition filed u/a 226 of the Con-
stitution of India praying to Direct the respondent
to entrust to the petitioner office duties and duties
of conductor other than line duty on bus routes. and
etc.

This Writ petition coming on for preliminary
hearing this day, the Court made the following: -

O R D E R

Heard Mr. S.G. Bhat, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner for direction upon the respondent to entrust him only office duties and duties of conductor other than line duty on bus routes on the ground that his physical condition is not befitting to discharge the duties of conductor.

3. Admittedly, the petitioner was appointed as a conductor in the respondent Corporation on 25.11.1975. Now, after bifurcation of the Corporation, he is serving the respondent Bangalore Metropolitan Transport Corporation in the same post. It seems the petitioner is presently working in the Ticket Section of the respondent Corporation discharging ministerial works instead of serving as a bus conductor on bus routes. The General Manager of the respondent having learnt about the fact that 18 conductors are working in the office instead of bus routes, under communication dt. 30.3.1998 (Annexure 'H') has directed for deputing them to discharge the duties of conductor. Though the name of the petitioner is not included in the list, apprehending that pursuant to the said direction he may be sent to discharge the duties of conductor, he has approached this Court for the relief referred to above.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the opinion that the writ petition is premature since no order appears to have been passed so far giving him

posting of conductor and more over if any such duty is assigned, then he may represent before the concerned authorities that because of physical disabilities his duty should be changed befitting his physical conditions. On receipt of the representtton of the said nature having been made the concerned authorities may consider the same in accordance with service regulations framed by the respondent Corporation and pass appropriate orders. Admittedly, the petitioner has nowhere stated that he has filed any representation.

5. In the said view of the matter, no relief as claimed in the writ petition can be granted. The writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
JUDGE

jsk/-

